INFORMATION CONCERNING
PROPOSED CHANGES IN
MANITOBA'S LABOUR LEGISLATION

Honourable Mary Beth Dolin,
Minister of Labour,
Province of Manitoba.
April, 1984.

Manitoba
Labour

INFORMATION CONCERNING PROPOSED CHANGES IN MANITOBA'S LABOUR LEGISLATION

APRIL, 1984

...it is in the public interest of the Province of Manitoba to further harmonious relations between employers and employees by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining between employers and unions as the freely designated representatives of employees;

(Preamble Labour Relations Act C.C.S.M. Chapter L10, Assented to July 20, 1972)

INTRODUCTION

In December, 1982, the Government of Manitoba committed itself to a major review of the province's labour legislation. It did so in the belief that good labour laws contribute to conditions that encourage all individuals to take an active role in building a society based on co-operation, and characterized by justice and equality. The government believes this will create a productive, industrially peaceful society; a society committed to the equality of the human condition.

The government has completed the first of the review's two phases. Begun in May, 1983, the initial phase dealt with labour relations matters; unionization, collective bargaining and group terminations.

An extensive series of public hearings formed a major part of the review process. Those hearings were followed by numerous consultations with labour and management. The willingness of labour and management to participate in this process is greatly appreciated.

It has been 12 years since comprehensive changes to the Manitoba Labour Relations Act were made. During this period, there has been a steady stream of litigation in which courts, labour boards and arbitration boards across the country have dealt with the complex policy issues presented by labour cases.

The laws governing collective bargaining affect a substantial sector of the labour force. Close to 50 percent of Manitoba's non-agricultural workers are covered by collective agreements. The Province's economic prosperity is heavily influenced by conditions in the unionized sector of the economy.

The government believes its initiatives will contribute to a climate of industrial harmony and will not only further enhance Manitoba as a province in which to work and invest but in some cases provide a model for industrial relations in this decade and beyond.

A. THE MANITOBA LABOUR BOARD

The Manitoba Labour Board is a specialist tribunal charged with the responsibilities of adjudicating labour related disputes and administering and interpreting legislation. It is the position of the government that a strong and independent Board will best serve the province's industrial relations community and the public.

The Government has confidence in the capable management and labour representatives on the Board and believes the tripartite make-up of the Board must continue to be an essential ingredient in its success. The government will further consider means of enhancing the contribution of labour and management representatives on the Board, including the possibility of half or full-time appointments.

In administering legislation and performing its duties, the Labour Board should not only be, but should appear to be, free of political interference. Because it is a specialist tribunal, neither should it be unduly interfered with by the courts so long as it is acting within its own jurisdiction.

Proposed amendments designed to foster independence include:

- tenure for the Board chair and vice-chairs: they may be appointed for terms of five to seven years and, once this is done, they may not be removed except by a resolution of the Legislature.

- The Board will have authority to set its own rules and regulations.

- The Board will report to the Legislature, through the Minister.

- Subject to Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council approval, the Board will have autonomy relating to staff and budget.

- The courts will only be able to set aside the Board's decisions if it has acted beyond the jurisdiction the Act sets out, and when the Board's procedures are challenged in court, it will be able to appear and explain them to the courts.

The Board will have the flexibility to sit in various panels, and occasionally to allow the neutral chair or vice-chair to sit alone to hear a case.

The Board will be master of its own practice and procedure. It is proposed that the Board be empowered to determine when an oral hearing is necessary in any given case. It will be entitled to issue policy guidelines to provide more guidance to the labour management community.

It is proposed to increase Board funding to levels comparable to other provinces. This will ensure amendments designed to improve its operations are implemented effectively and will guarantee that important practices such as the issuing of written reasons for decisions continue.

Along with the Board's independence, a new emphasis on settlement is probably the most significant change proposed for the Board. Such efforts would be undertaken by settlement officers or by Board members themselves.

To encourage frank discussion, attempts at settlement of unfair labour practices should be without prejudice. Any Board member who has participated in settlement efforts would not be entitled to hear the case, should those efforts fail. As well, in other classes of cases (particularly certification applications) the Board's staff should play a fact-finding role to assist the Board and the parties involved. It is proposed that section 21 of the Act be amended so that fact-finders and settlement officers are responsible to the Board, rather than reporting to the Minister. The provisions respecting examiners should be changed to make them more workable.

There are a number of areas where it is proposed that the Board's discretion and responsibilities be expanded. For example, in dealing with unfair labour practices, the Board should have the flexibility to determine whether or not to hear a case, in view of the length of time that has passed since the alleged occurence of the incident. The present 6 month period is too inflexible: sometimes it is too long and at other times, (particularly when information about the complaint was unavailable for a long period of time), it is too short. There should also be increased remedial powers to deal with unfair labour practices. Where a particularly flagrant abuse has occurred, the Board should have the discretion to issue an order for exemplary, as well as compensatory damages.

The Board should have authority to grant adjournments on fair terms, to make conditional orders, and to make interim orders.

By further amendment, our tripartite Board would be entitled to issue orders requiring employers to provide lists of employee names, addresses and phone numbers to a union which demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Board, that it is making a genuine effort to organize a non-union workplace. The Board must be satisfied that, without such a list, union efforts would be hampered due to the size of the unit or other circumstances. Privacy interests would be protected by exempting the employer from divulging unlisted phone numbers.

It is proposed that the Board be given new responsibilities to enforce the existing provision in the Act which obliges employers to provide, to certified unions, the names of all bargaining unit members, their classifications, rates of pay and benefits. Employers would be obliged to comply with such requests within 15 working days (unless this is not reasonably possible) and failure to do so would constitute an unfair labour practice. In addition, the information obligations would be expanded slightly to require details of the costing of benefits.

B. ESTABLISHING THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RELATIONSHIP: THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS

The right of employees to choose to unionize without interference has long been accepted as public policy. Despite support of this policy by all major employer groups in the province, there are still employers who take steps to prevent employees from making a free choice. These employers are either unaware of the provisions of the law, or in a few cases, disregard the law. Some changes may be in order to ensure that the certification process does not get bogged down by delays and acrimony, providing for a poor start to the bargaining process.

The Manitoba Labour Board plays a key role in the certification process and must be able to deal fairly and effectively with certification issues. It must do so without the delays that are annoying to both labour and management.

The Government proposes to amend the Act:

- allowing the Board discretion to issue interim certificates where the only issue in dispute is exclusions (whether a person is or is not performing managerial or confidential functions) or appropriateness, and regardless of the way the issue is resolved, certification would eventually be ordered;

- making it clear that the Board should determine the true wishes of the employees by signed membership cards, as at the date of application;

- allowing employees to change their minds about joining a union until the date the union files its application and all its cards;

- ensuring that the Board hears any objections to the way the cards were solicited and if there is evidence of improprieties, the Board may disregard the cards and order a vote or dismiss the application;

- directing the Board to certify where the Board finds that 55% of the employees have signed cards which have not been revoked prior to the date of application;

- directing the Board to order a vote where it finds only 45-55% of the employees have signed cards: the union will only be certified if a majority of those voting agree;

- directing the Board to dismiss the application if the union has signed cards from less than 45% of the employees;

- abolishing the minimum $1.00 membership fee: a person's signature, duly witnessed, on a card is the important and relevant evidence of commitment;

- allowing the Board discretion to certify the union without majority support if it finds the employer has committed a serious unfair labour practice which may reasonably have prevented employees from freely deciding whether they want a union;

- allowing employees to apply to the Board to challenge voluntary recognition, (within the first year) on the basis that the union recognized by the employer did not really have the support of a majority of employees.

It is also proposed that the Board be encouraged to develop pamphlets available to the public explaining all the steps in the certification process.

Section 16 of our Act dealing with soliciting membership during working hours should be reworded using language similar to that contained in the Ontario Labour Relations Act. Our Act would state that nothing in it authorizes any person to disrupt the ongoing business functions of the employer by attempting to persuade (or dissuade) employees from unionizing. This would allow employers to enforce bona fide no solicitation rules by disciplining employees who disobey them.

Another proposed amendment may broaden the scope of those workers entitled to obtain collective bargaining rights through the certification process. The Act's definition of "dependent contractors" (considered employees under the Act) is rather narrow and technical and confined essentially to truckers. The proposed definition would allow our tripartite board more flexibility to determine whether a person should be considered an employee for the purposes of the Act.

A number of amendments dealing with decertification are proposed. They will clarify the certification and decertification sections so a proper balance is achieved between employees' rights to change their minds and reject their union or choose another and the need to provide a union with a real chance to demonstrate its collective bargaining abilities. Under the proposed amendments:

- no such applications would be allowed until 12 months after the initial certification order had finally been resolved (if court proceedings followed the original order, the time would run from when they are over);

- no such applications would be allowed until after 12 months of a legal strike (and after that, it would be up to the Board discretion);

- if an application for decertification is heard during a legal strike, unless there are compelling industrial relations reasons to the contrary, the voting constituency would be confined only to those employees in the bargaining unit and on the payroll at the time the strike commenced and who have a continuing interest in its outcome;

- if the Board finds that the employer has frustrated the collective bargaining process and not given it a fair chance, the Board would have the discretion to reject an application without ordering a vote;

- if there is any fraud involved in the original application, that comes to light later, the employer or any interested person involved would be able to apply to decertify at any time;

- if the union "walks away" from the bargaining unit and abandons its rights and obligations, the employer would be able to ask the Board to investigate and if this were the case, the Board would be able to decertify.

What happens to collective bargaining rights when a business is sold or merged with another is an area needing clarification. The basic principle is already part of our Act: as long as the business carries on, the obligations and responsibilities of the certified union and the collective agreement continue. But sometimes there is difficulty in determining finer points, and our Board is not given enough discretion to sort these matters out. The Act does not provide enough guidance so that purchasers of businesses will know what obligations to expect. Amendments are planned to clarify these issues.

Some employers believe that section 6(2) of the Act, restricting what employers are entitled to say about unions and their own policies when a union is being organized, infringes on their freedom of expression under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Unions, on the other hand, view the provision as necessary to ensure their freedom of association, also guaranteed by the Charter. The Supreme Court of Canada is just beginning to explain what is meant by these two freedoms and what limits are reasonable. The Government will carefully monitor the Supreme Court's decisions before any changes are proposed in this area.

Once the union is certified, it has a rightful role in relation to the workplace. Union staff representatives should be entitled to access to an employer's premises to communicate with members of the bargaining unit, but only at such times and locations, and in such a manner so that the employer's interest in production at the workplace is fully respected. Hopefully, unions and employers will come to their own agreements about the times and circumstances for this access (usually lunch or dinner breaks). If they are having difficulty the Labour Board settlement officer would assist and if ultimately necessary, the Board would decide the terms of access.

Individual rights would be specifically protected by a series of proposed amendments to the Act. Unions, in administering agreements, would be obliged to represent all those in the bargaining unit (not just union members) fairly, in good faith and without discrimination. Unions would have to take reasonable care in handling dismissal cases. Individuals who feel the union has not met these obligations would be able to go to the Board for an appropriate remedy.

Individuals should have certain rights to participate in unions guaranteed. Thus, a union would not be able to call a strike unless a majority of those voting approve: both union and non-union members of the bargaining unit would continue to be entitled to vote by secret ballot. Similarly, before any collective agreement is finalized, it would have to be submitted to the entire bargaining unit for approval. In both situations, reasonable notice would be required.

Religious objectors have requested amendments to the Act to improve their protection. It is proposed that their requests be met: any adherent to a faith which precludes union membership and financial support would be exempted from any provision requiring union membership; and "dues" payable should go, not to the union, but to a charity. The Board would adjudicate any differences over these provisions.

C. THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS

The goal of collective bargaining is simply to reach a fair collective agreement. In over 90 per cent of cases that goal is achieved without any work stoppage. However, when a stoppage does occur it often has serious effects on the employees, employer, third parties and the general public.

While the Government recognizes the right to strike as fundamental in a democratic society it also recognizes that all those involved in collective bargaining would welcome mechanisms designed to avoid work stoppages.

The Government proposes to introduce amendments that would further reduce the incidence of work stoppages by offering new alternatives and strengthening available options.

Conciliation and Mediation would be strengthened by giving the Minister the right to appoint a mediator in any case where she feels this might be of assistance. Such an appointment can now only occur at the request of both parties. Conciliation officers would be given the power to call meetings as the conciliator feels necessary. Currently, legislation limits the conciliator to calling only one meeting. Conciliation Services would be further enhanced through the development of new programmes, such as preventive mediation, pioneered in the U.S. and already implemented successfully in other provinces.

First contract legislation, which allows the Board to impose a fair first agreement when the parties have been unable to negotiate such an agreement, is a relatively new innovation in Manitoba and has proven beneficial. Its most important function is to encourage parties to reach their own agreements. Some amendments may be necessary to improve the process. First, applications would not be filed with the Minister but directly with the Labour Board, removing the potential of political involvement in the process. Second, legislation would require the parties to seek conciliation before asking the Board to impose an agreement. Finally, the Act's present requirement that the Board take into account whether or not there has been bad faith bargaining in settling the terms of the agreement should be removed. The object is not to impose a punishment or remedy for bad faith bargaining, but rather a fair contract to get the collective bargaining process off to a good start.

The Government is committed to further development of a co-operative, positive problem-solving approach to industrial relations. Therefore, it proposes to introduce an innovative amendment requiring that, at the request of either party, a collective agreement contain a provision for ongoing consultation throughout the term of the agreement.

Another proposed innovation would be legislation providing for resolving collective bargaining disputes, in second and subsequent contracts, via Final Offer Selection (F.O.S.). This is a special form of arbitration, under which a selector is entitled to choose either the management offer or the union proposal as the basis of a collective agreement. There would be increased pressure on the parties to be more reasonable and to ultimately resolve their differences. Mediation would be provided by Conciliation Services throughout the process to assist the parties to settle, by either accepting one side's final offer or reaching some other compromise before the selector must choose one or the other.

The proposed legislation would leave the ultimate determination of whether a particular dispute should be resolved in this way to a Government supervised vote of the entire bargaining unit. To do otherwise would be to allow union leaders or management to take away the democratic right to strike. If the vote was favourable, work stoppages (strikes and lockouts) would not be allowed, or if in progress, could not continue. Instead, the F.O.S. process would resolve the dispute. Either management or the union would be entitled to call for the vote described above.

If the bargaining unit approved and the process were used, the parties would be obliged to agree on a selector; if they were not able to do so, the Labour Board would choose from among a list of selectors it had developed.

The request for the F.O.S. vote could be made at any time during a set of negotiations: but even if the vote favours F.O.S., the Labour Board would have power to screen applications to ensure a real effort to bargain had been made prior to the appointment of a selector. There would also be a time limitation imposed where a strike or lockout is in progress. Both sides would lose their right to request an F.O.S. vote if a work stoppage persists beyond 12 months.

The proposed legislation should provide an innovative way to reduce industrial conflict and economic losses to the provincial economy caused by strikes and lockouts.

It would:

- spur both sides to reach their own agreement;
- deter both sides from insisting on proposals which are clearly unreasonable;
- provide a way to resolve disputes in an orderly, and peaceful fashion;
- lead to much more harmonious industrial relations with many spin-off benefits to the provincial economy.

D. METHODS FOR MAINTAINING INDUSTRIAL HARMONY

For purposes of industrial peace, the right to strike is removed during the term of a collective agreement and in its place the arbitration process is substituted, a process intended to provide a fast, inexpensive, informal binding dispute resolution mechanism, separate from the courts. Having obliged parties to use this process, it is important to ensure that it functions effectively. Therefore, the Government proposes to introduce a series of amendments designed to improve the arbitration process.

The model arbitration clause contained in the Act and used where none exists in a collective agreement would no longer be of the tripartite variety, instead it would provide for hearings by sole arbitrators (unless the parties mutually agree to refer the particular case to a three-person board).

In another initiative to reduce delay, parties would be encouraged to name their sole arbitrators or chairpersons in their collective agreements, (either via a named individual or a rotating panel). If they did not, the chairperson of the Labour Board would choose a panel, based on a list developed by the Board in consultation with the Labour-Management Review Committee. Thus, the Minister's role in appointing arbitrators would be removed and the chairperson of the Board would assume this function.

Grievance mediation is a dispute resolution method in which a third party attempts to assist the parties to reach agreement by advice or persuasion without any power to reach an agreement. It is quicker than arbitration, less formal and less adversarial. The process is conducive to good labour relations and would be encouraged in two ways:

- Parties would be encouraged to name a mediator in their collective agreements: if they do so, the Government will pay one third of the costs.

- Mediation would be offered by Manitoba Labour through Conciliation Services, as a matter of course in expedited arbitrations, and, in other cases, upon the joint request of the parties.

To promote candid settlement discussions, legislation would ensure that communications between mediators and parties be privileged.

Proposed amendments would give arbitrators the power to expedite proceedings by ordering production of documents and particulars prior to the hearing to ensure that parties are well prepared, reducing requests for adjournments. To ensure that one party or the other is not unfairly prejudiced, arbitrators would have power to grant adjournments on such terms as seem just. Statutory guidelines for issuance of awards would be established as: within 20 working days from the conclusion of the hearing for sole arbitrators and 40 working days for a tripartite board. Failure to do so would not result in a loss of jurisdiction, but would entitle the Labour Board to intervene to attempt to speed-up the decision. Ultimately, the Board would have the power to order a rehearing by another arbitrator or hear a case itself.

A new concept is proposed to deal with the unfair prejudice that can often result to a dismissed grievor awaiting his/her arbitration hearing. The Act would be amended to provide that, where an employer dismisses an employee or imposes a suspension beyond 30 days, the Labour Board would have the discretion to make an interim order reinstating the grievor pending the outcome of arbitration proceedings. If there was evidence that reinstatement might cause injury to the grievor or or others, endanger property or seriously prejudice the employer's operations, it would not be ordered. Although this is a new concept in the context of grievance arbitration, interim orders are available in almost every other branch of law.

An important initiative proposed to deal with delays in the process would be the implementation of a new expedited arbitration procedure. The proposed procedure is modelled on the successful Ontario program. The main features of the process would be:

- Only the party initiating the grievance would be entitled to refer a grievance to the expedited procedure, except that where a grievance concerned a dismissal or a suspension in excess of 30 days, and an interim order of reinstatement is made by the Board, either party would be entitled to refer the grievance to expedited arbitration;

- Upon referral to the expedited procedure, the Labour Board would:

    - appoint a mediator to attempt to resolve the issue before the arbitration hearing;

    - schedule the case to be heard as soon as possible, (but no later than 20 working days from the date of referral) by either a private sole arbitrator appointed by the Labour Board or by a Labour Board chair or vice-chair sitting alone;

- entertain any applications for consolidation of grievances, production of documents, issuance of particulars and subpoenas and make appropriate orders;

- Following the hearing, the arbitrator would be required to issue a decision as soon as possible, but not later than 10 working days, in the case of termination cases; and in all other cases, 20 working days.

Changes to the Act are proposed to clarify the procedural and remedial powers of arbitrators. There are two key proposals in this area. The first is a section ensuring that arbitrators are to resolve the real dispute between the parties under the collective agreement, regardless of the precise wording of the grievance. This would minimize any likelihood of industrial unrest that could result from rigid formal or technical approaches. A second important amendment would set out the general remedial power of an arbitration board in the Act itself. Arbitrators would be authorized to provide a final and conclusive settlement of a dispute arising under a collective agreement. This would include powers:

- to make monetary orders;

- to order reinstatement of an employee who has been dismissed contrary to the collective agreement;

- to order a union or employer to rectify any disciplinary action taken which contravenes the agreement;

- to substitute a more appropriate disciplinary act where a dismissal or other such act is found to be excessive in all the circumstances;

- to dismiss a grievance if there has been unreasonable prejudicial delay in bringing it;

- to relieve against time limits and procedural requirements upon fair terms.

Arbitrators would also be empowered to rectify agreements, where some mistake has been made in transcribing terms. This would be an improvement over the present situation, where rectification is available, but only through the more cumbersome court processes.

Once rendered, arbitration awards would be filed with the Labour Board and available for public inspection. The Labour Board would catalogue awards and publish summaries for the benefit of the labour management community. Collective agreements will continue to be filed. However, public access would be permitted in all cases, unless one or the other party obtains an exemption from the Board on the grounds of undue prejudice to its interests.

The Government believes the Act should also be amended to include a privative clause protecting arbitration proceedings from any judicial review except where there is a jurisdictional error; thus, courts should be able to intervene only where a fair process has not been followed, where awards contain patently unreasonable interpretations of the collective agreement or where there is other serious misconduct. The enactment of such a clause would further the statutory policy of recognizing that expert arbitrators, familiar with labour relations, ought to be entrusted with the final responsibility of interpreting such agreements.

It is proposed that two new clauses be required in every collective agreement. The first is a provision that no employee shall be dismissed or disciplined without just cause. (The provision would be worded to allow for probationary periods). Just cause provisions are believed to be included in the great majority of existing Manitoba collective agreements.

As noted earlier, the Government proposes to amend the Act to require certified unions to act fairly in exercising their rights as bargaining agents. It therefore believes it to be appropriate to require management to act fairly in exercising its rights and proposes to introduce an amendment requiring every agreement to contain a provision obliging the employer to act reasonably, fairly and in good faith in a manner consistent with the collective agreement as a whole in its administration of the agreement.

These amendments, taken together, should improve relationships during the term of collective agreements and where "rights" disputes do arise during this time, they should help to ensure that they are fully and expeditiously resolved and not left to fester and create unnecessary discord in collective bargaining relationships.

Despite the best efforts and intentions of the parties involved, strikes and lockouts do occur. The Government proposes amendments which will ensure that strike/lockout conflict does not escalate to unacceptable levels.

The hiring of replacement workers to perform the work of striking employees is a practice that can lead to great industrial unrest and strife, especially if striking employees believe they may permanently lose their jobs to these workers.

The Government of Quebec has passed legislation prohibiting the hiring of replacement workers. In New Brunswick, the practice is prohibited in the public sector. Unions in Manitoba feel similar legislation should be introduced in this province. They argue that permitting the hiring of replacement workers gives one side the power to destroy totally the strike sanction and creates an unfair imbalance in our system.

Employers remain opposed to such legislation, saying it would leave a business hostage to unreasonable union demands.

The Government believes some amendments are in order to ensure that strikers do not risk permanent loss of their jobs to replacements and so that replacement workers clearly understand their temporary status. Proposed amendments should help to prevent volatile situations from arising. Our Act already guarantees reinstatement once an agreement is concluded. The Government proposes to improve the provisions as follows:

- employers who offer permanent employment to replacement workers would commit an unfair labour practice. (But should there be sufficient work after the strike, this would not prevent the employer from retaining the replacements after the strike is over);

- employers who hire replacement workers would be required to make clear that there is an industrial dispute in progress and that they are only being hired for the length of the strike. (No advance notice of termination will be required once the strike is settled);

- section 11 would be clarified to ensure that all employees are entitled to reinstatement when a strike is over, as long as work is available, and that work performed by replacement workers is to be considered available work.

Two other amendments would also help to keep conflict associated with work stoppages from reaching unacceptable or unfair levels.

First, to ensure that the practice of professional strikebreaking does not spread to Manitoba, a provision similar to one in Ontario, prohibiting such practices as infiltration, harassment and spying is proposed.

Second, under our present legislation, pension benefits are considered so important that employers may not threaten to deny them because an employee exercises his/her right to strike. The Act would be clarified so that threats to deny other important benefits (such as medical, dental, long-term disability) could not be made, provided, however, that the union agrees to continue paying the appropriate premiums during the work stoppage.

E. GROUP TERMINATION/PLANT RENEWAL

Plant closures and mass terminations are not unique to periods of economic recession. Technological change, while offering enormous economic potential, may replace economic fluctuations as a primary reason for closures and mass terminations.

The Government is committed to seeing Manitoba play a leading role in the advent of technological change. This province has the potential to be not only internationally competitive but an international leader in this area.

As Manitoba progresses along the path of high technology, the Government feels it is critical that parallel policies are developed to deal with the human side of technological change. Indeed, there seems to be a growing public consensus consistent with the Honourable Samuel Freedman's observation that disruptions of the lives of affected workers and their families, the implications for public support through needed welfare and other social services, the added burdens on unemployment insurance, the need for retraining and replacement, the economic implications for the community in lowered revenues take decisions in the area of technological change beyond the realm of individual decision making.

It is the intention of the Government to use as part of its basis for developing policy in this area, the study of group termination completed in Phase I of the Labour Law Review combined with the study of technological change planned for the Review's second phase.

The Government feels this integrated approach to the questions of group termination and technological change is essential in ensuring that all Manitobans share in the economic benefits offered by the application of new technology.

CONCLUSION

The Manitoba Labour Law Review is but one element in the Government's ongoing development of economic policy.

The legislative and policy changes contained in this paper are essential elements of a productive, industrially peaceful society committed to the equality of the human condition. The proposals recognize the legitimate concerns of Manitoba's business and labour communities and the need for co-operation and harmony in the province's unionized sector.

The Government believes these initiatives will further enhance Manitoba as a province of economic opportunity dedicated to a valued quality of life for all who work and live here.